



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

De Ione fabula Euripidea quaestiones selectae. Doct. Diss. by L. K. ENTHOVEN. Bonn. 1880.

The writer endeavors to settle two points in regard to this play: 1st, its date, and 2d, the place on the Acropolis where Creusa is understood to have had her interview with Apollo. He rejects the date assumed by Boeckh (B. C. 429) and by Fix (B. C. 420), and decides that the play was probably produced in 412: (1) because an examination of its metre shows it to have about the same number of resolved feet as the Helena which was represented in B. C. 412; (2) because in Ar. Lysist. (B. C. 411) Cinesias makes a suggestion to Myrrhina as to the cave of Pan which may have been easily understood as an allusion to the mention of the same cave in the Ion; (3) because there are several verbal coincidences between the Ion and the Helena (some of these are so striking as rather to justify the inference that, though they betray the same author, they could hardly have been introduced by him in two plays written in the same year); and (4) from certain points of resemblance in the plots of the two plays. As to the scene of Creusa's mishap, the writer decides that it must have been the cave of Pan; and disposes of the claim of the cave of Aglauros by endeavoring to show that the five places in which the term *μακραί* is found applied to a portion of the north side of the Acropolis are corrupt or interpolated. In regard to three of these he is able to show that Usener concurs in the rejection of them; the fourth is rejected by Paley and Dindorf; and in the fifth he considers that *μυχῶδες μακραίς* is a false reading for *μυχῶδῶσιν ἄκραις*: and as the name *μακραί*, as a designation of a portion of the Acropolis, occurs nowhere else, we are expected to draw the inference that after it had arisen by mistake in v. 492 it got itself inserted in the other four places. How this is probable the writer does not show. He discusses also the meaning of *γάλα* and *θυμέλη* in this play, and the use of *ὅστις* in Euripides, and comments on certain difficulties connected with vv. 804-7, 1010-7, 1426-32, 1575-94. In handling these, as well as in the other matters treated of, if he does not exhibit as much tenderness as the conservative critics of the old school would show, he at least gives intelligible reasons for the course he recommends; and if the play had come down to us in the shape in which his emendations and omissions would leave it, the work of the commentators would have been much lighter than it has been.

C. D. M.

A History of Greece from the earliest times to the present. By T. T. TIMAYENIS. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1881.

The author of this history thus describes in his preface the views with which he has undertaken it. "While I cheerfully acknowledge my obligations to Gibbon and Grote—the most eminent of modern historians—a careful study of the Greek writers has led me to differ from them on many important matters. The peculiar feature of the present work, therefore, is that it is founded on Hellenic sources. I have not hesitated to follow the Father of History in portraying the heroism and the sacrifices of the Hellenes in their first war for independence . . . nor have I scrupled, in narrating the great civil strife of the nation, to base my assumptions and conclusions on the testimony of the inimit-

able historian of the Peloponnesian war." It seems then that Grote—for Gibbon may here be left out of the account—has founded his history on non-Hellenic sources; that he has failed to give just weight to the testimony of Herodotus and Thucydides, and has manifested a tendency to rely too much on the evidence of inferior witnesses or on his own conception of what the facts must have been. This is a position which may fairly be occupied by any student of Greek history; but he will not be justified in presenting this assumed failure of Grote as the *raison d'être* of an improved history he proposes to write, unless he directs attention to particular instances where Grote has gone astray through misinterpreting or undervaluing the statements of the earliest writers, and shows by quotation or reference that in these cases the evidence we possess does not warrant the inference which Grote has deduced from it. Such a refutation is certainly not contained in a note like the following: I p. 329, "I confess that nothing in Grote's 'History of Greece' astonishes me so much as his attempt to represent Kleon under colors that would befit a Themistokles or Kimon, rather than the most consummate villain that ancient Hellas ever produced. His arguments are eloquent and worthy of himself, but they are certainly illusory and misleading": yet this, with a similar note on p. 339, comprises all or nearly all that the writer of this book gives us to substantiate his claim to be a more faithful follower than Grote of Herodotus and Thucydides. In the whole 860 pages of the two volumes there are not more than twenty-five references to authorities which can with any propriety be called precise. There are perhaps three times that number in which the reader is directed generally to "Thucydides," "Plutarch," etc., and about forty in which Greek passages are cited without any particular indication of their source. It may be noted in passing that the Greek is not printed with as much accuracy as might fairly be expected, considering the nationality of the writer (see I, pp. 252, 288, 294, 346; II, p. 267, etc.). But it may be said that any considerable number of quotations and any discussion of controverted views would mar the utility of the book for 'the general reader,' for whom it is presumably intended. Such a person will have every reason to be satisfied if he can feel assured that the statements made to him are in accord with the fair and natural interpretation of what the ancient writers have actually said. The necessary limits of this notice forbid a detailed examination of the book to ascertain how far it meets this reasonable expectation of 'the general reader,' and only two or three statements made in the early pages can be referred to. On pp. 15-21 we have an account of the Trojan war, and at the end of it we are expressly told that it is "the Iliad of Homer to which we are indebted for the foregoing narrative." Among the incidents mentioned is (p. 20) that Hector "fell, and Achilles, still unappeased, bound the lifeless body to his war-chariot and dragged it three times round the walls of Troy." This statement seems to be based on a confusion of Il. X 251 and Ω 16; or is it rather simply a reminiscence of Virg. Aen. I 483? On p. 54 the tribes of Epirus are named Chaonians, Thesprotians, Kassopaeans and Molossians, and we are told that "Herodotus calls the two last mentioned tribes Greeks, but Thucydides considers them as barbarians." The Kassopaeans, however, do not appear to be named by Herodotus or Thucydides at all. On the same page we read, 'according to Aristotle the land of Thesprotia, in the neighborhood of Dodona,

was the most ancient seat of the Hellenic race." It is hazardous to assert that this statement about Thesprotia is not found in the works of so voluminous a writer as Aristotle; but it has at any rate escaped the notice of H. Bonitz, the laborious compiler of the Berlin Index. Aristotle does indeed say that ancient Hellas is *ἡ περὶ Δωδώνην καὶ τὸν Ἀχελῷον*; but there is no mention of Thesprotia in that passage, and Kiepert places Dodona in Molossis. On the next page in the description of the Peloponnesus we are told that it is "traversed from north to south by two rugged ranges of mountains radiating from Mount Pindus." How this can be so, since we have learned on p. 36 that Pindus "divides Epirus on the west from Thessaly on the east," is not explained. Another curious geographical statement is found on p. 37. "The romantic vale of Tempe, through which the Peneius escapes into the sea between Mounts Pelion and Ossa, is perhaps the most enchanting spot in Greece." The fervor of this and the subsequent description suggests that the author must himself have visited this scene, and therefore his statements may be taken as those of an eye-witness. But Kiepert's chart makes the Peneius issue between Olympus on the north and Ossa on the south, and places Pelion still further south of Ossa. Can it be either that the river has made for itself a new outlet or that the mountains have changed their places since the surveys were made on which Kiepert's map is based? It may be thought that these criticisms are trivial, and that it is ungracious thus to call attention to what are probably oversights and accidental blemishes in a work which may notwithstanding be on the whole a clear and readable narrative of the story of Greece. When however they are considered in connection with the fact before noticed, that the author has throughout his work compelled his readers to rely almost solely on his own narrative and abstained from giving them an easy means of testing his accuracy, and has besides in his preface challenged comparison with Grote on the ground of his superior fidelity to the ancient authorities, it will be felt that the mention of them is not irrelevant.

The book is written in a plain and unaffected style, which does not need the apology which the writer makes for it. It is by no means heavy reading, and if it were relieved of the pretentiousness of the preface and subjected throughout to a revision which should make the exactness of its statements approximate more nearly to that of Grote's, it might be recommended as giving in a moderate compass a readable narrative of the whole history of Greece from the earliest times to the present.

C. D. MORRIS.

Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik von HERMANN PAUL. Halle, 1881.

Kleine Mittelhochdeutsche Grammatik von KARL WEINHOLD. Wien, 1881.

The first is volume II of the 'Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken Germanischer Dialecte.' It is intended to serve a three-fold purpose: as an introduction to Middle High German for the beginner in Germanic philology; as a text-book in the Gymnasium, and to supply the wants of all who would read and study M. H. G. literature. The first purpose is best served, the sixty-nine pages being about evenly divided between 'lautlehre' and 'flexionslehre.' The only defect